REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that transmission data and a reception result request are transmitted to a receiving-end machine, and retransmission data is generated based on the reception result from the receiving-end machine. Independent claims 22 and 23, and claim 14, have been amended to recite that "the data reception device returns the reception result notification to a data transmission device upon receipt of the transmission data, and the data transmission device generates the retransmission data based on the reception result." New claims 29 and 30 are added by the present amendment. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at pages 19 and 46).

Claims 10-13 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-13 and 25-28 have been amended in the manner recommended by the Examiner. It is believed that the amendments overcome the rejections under 35 USC 101.

Claims 1-4 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,775,705 to Maeda. Claims 14-23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0020961 to Tanimoto. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of U.S. Patent 7,000,157 to Okamoto et al. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Tanimoto. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1 and 8 over Maeda, the Maeda reference does not teach or suggest a transmission control section that transmits both transmission data and a reception result request to a receiving-end machine simultaneously, where retransmission data is generated based on the reception result received from the receiving-end machine.

In Maeda, "before an original is read," a transmitting-side apparatus 1 transmits a "capability request" in order to determine the "reception capability" of a receiving-side apparatus 2, and the receiving-side apparatus 2 transmits a capability response to the transmitting-side apparatus 1 (see, e.g., column 5, lines 49-61 of Maeda). The transmitting-side apparatus 1 reads the original and transmits image data to the receiving-side apparatus 2; in response, the receiving-side apparatus 2 transmits a confirmation message to the transmitting-side apparatus 1 (see column 6, lines 1-15).

In other words, the "capability request" is sent in Maeda by the transmitting-side apparatus 1 in advance of transmitting transmission data or image data to the receiving-side apparatus 2.

Therefore, the system of Maeda does not send transmission data "along with the reception result request," and then generate retransmission data "based on the reception result from the receiving-end machine" *as claimed*.

According to the Applicants' claimed invention, only a single transmission combining both the transmission data and the reception result request is transmitted to a receiving-end machine, which can improve efficiency of data transmission (see, e.g., specification at page 46).

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 22 and 23 over Tanimoto, the Tanimoto reference does not teach or suggest a data reception device that receives transmission data and returns a reception result notification, where a data transmission device generates retransmission data based on the reception result.

In Tanimoto, a first email is sent from the transmitting machine to the receiving machine merely to obtain suitable data formats readable on the receiving machine, but no image data is sent with the first email. Instead, the image data is sent with the third email, and because the image data is sent in a format appropriate for the receiving machine, it is unnecessary to send "retransmission data" in Tanimoto.

In contrast, according to the Applicants' claimed invention, only a single transmission combining both the transmission data and the reception result request is transmitted to a receiving-end machine, which can improve efficiency of data transmission (see, e.g., specification at page 46).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 24 over the proposed combination of Maeda in view of Tanimoto, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest at least a data reception device that receives transmission data and returns a reception result notification, where a data transmission device generates retransmission data based on the reception result, for at least the reasons discussed above.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Date: July 18, 2007

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874